## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC  Plaintiff,  vs.  NEC CORPORATION OF AMERICA, INC.  Defendant.	\$\text{\tin}\text{\tetx{\text{\tetx{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\tin}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\texitil\tinz{\texi}\text{\texititt{\text{\texi}\text{\texitilex{\tiint{\text{\texi}\texitilex{\tiint{\texitilex{\tiint{\texitilex{\t	CASE NO. 6:11-CV-655 PATENT CASE
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC  Plaintiff,  vs.  GOOGLE INC. AND YOUTUBE, LLC  Defendants.	00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	CASE NO. 6:11-CV-656 PATENT CASE
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC Plaintiff, vs.  NETAPP, INC.  Defendant.	w w w w w w w w	CASE NO. 6:11-CV-657 PATENT CASE

PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC  Plaintiff,  vs.  AMAZON.COM, INC.; AMAZON WEB SERVICES LLC; AND DROPBOX, INC.  Defendants.	<pre>\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ CASE NO. 6:11-CV-658 \$ PATENT CASE \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$</pre>
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC  Plaintiff,  vs.  CARINGO, INC.  Defendant.	<pre>\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ CASE NO. 6:11-CV-659 \$ PATENT CASE \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$</pre>
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC  Plaintiff,  vs.  EMC CORPORATION, AND VMWARE, INC.  Defendants.	<pre>\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ CASE NO. 6:11-CV-660 \$ PATENT CASE \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$</pre>
PERSONALWEB TECHNOLGIES, LLC Plaintiff, vs.  AUTONOMY, INC.  Defendant.	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ CASE NO. 6:11-CV-683 \$ PATENT CASE \$ \$

## **ORDER**

Before the Court are the parties' Joint Motion for Protective Order and Joint Motion to Enter Discovery Order (611cv655, Docket Nos. 41, 42; 611cv656, Docket Nos. 78, 79; 611cv657, Docket Nos. 55, 56; 611cv658, Docket Nos. 75, 76; 611cv659, Docket Nos. 61, 62; 611cv660, Docket Nos. 65, 66; 611cv683, Docket Nos. 51, 52). The Court **GRANTS** all of the motions pursuant to the following resolutions.

## E-Discovery Order

After careful review of the parties' positions regarding the E-Discovery Order, the Court finds that Plaintiff PersonalWeb's position urging adoption of the Eastern District of Texas' Model Order Regarding E-Discovery in Patent Cases is correct. Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to file a motion requesting entry of the operative e-discovery order.

## Protective Order

The Court further resolves the parties' disputes regarding entry of a protective order in the above-captioned cases as follows:

- Provision 1.A.6, Counsel Covered by Protective Order: Defendants' proposal shall be adopted;
- Provision 1.C.2(a), Third-Party Site Production: Plaintiff's proposal shall be adopted;
- Provision 1.C.2(a), Use of Computer During Source Code Review: Plaintiff's proposal shall be adopted;
- Provision 1.C.2(c), Note-Taking During Source Code Review: Plaintiff's proposal shall be adopted, with the caveat that there shall be no wholesale copying of source code;
- Provision 1.C.2(d): Source Code Printing: Plaintiff's proposal regarding a meet and confer after production of source code is adopted;
- Provision 1.C.2(e): Objections to Source Code Printing: Plaintiff's proposal shall be adopted;
- Provision 1.C.2(k)(2), Limits on Technical Advisors: Defendants' proposal shall be adopted;
- Provision 1.C.2(m): Logging of Code Images: Plaintiff's proposal shall be adopted;
- Provision 8.F: Plaintiff's proposal shall be adopted.

Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to file a motion requesting entry of the operative protective order reflecting the foregoing resolutions.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 7th day of August, 2012.



LEONARD DAVIS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE